

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-22 have been canceled. New claims 23-42 have been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants' regard as the invention. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 1, 8, and 14 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rogalski *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0141484) in view of Kallio (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0147008). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons: the rejection of claims 1, 3, and 7-9 is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 1-22, and Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

The subject application is generally directed to operating mobile devices over regulated and unregulated wireless networks. To this end, new independent claim 23 recites ***receiving a call associated with a telephone number of a subscriber; directing the call to a first mobile device via an unregulated wireless connection, the first mobile device associated with the subscriber; directing the call to a second mobile device via a regulated wireless connection, the second mobile device associated with the subscriber; and routing the call to the first mobile device or the second mobile device based on, at least in part, whether the first mobile device or the second mobile device is answered by the subscriber.*** (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0052]-[0073]).

Rogalski *et al.* disclose transmitting voice data over a 802.11b interface. (*See, e.g.*, Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0078]). Kallio discloses a mobile station that roams between a

Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN). (See, e.g., Kallio at paragraph [0010]). Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***receiving a call associated with a telephone number of a subscriber; directing the call to a first mobile device via an unregulated wireless connection, the first mobile device associated with the subscriber; directing the call to a second mobile device via a regulated wireless connection, the second mobile device associated with the subscriber; and routing the call to the first mobile device or the second mobile device based on, at least in part, whether the first mobile device or the second mobile device is answered by the subscriber***, as recited in claim 23. Instead, Rogalski *et al.* merely disclose supporting voice communications over a WLAN (see, e.g., Rogalski *et al.* paragraph [0038]); and Kallio merely discloses a mobile station serves as a user's interface with the GSM network and the WLAN. (See, e.g., Kallio at paragraph [0024]).

New dependent claim 24 recites ***receiving a medium access control (MAC) address from the first mobile device via the unregulated wireless connection; determining an internet protocol (IP) address based on the received MAC address; and transmitting data associated with the call to and from the first mobile device based on, at least in part, the routing and the determined IP address***. (Support for this element can be found at, e.g., Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0046] and [0068]). It is respectfully submitted that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***receiving a medium access control (MAC) address from the first mobile device via the unregulated wireless connection; determining an internet protocol (IP) address based on the received MAC address; and transmitting data associated with the call to and from the first mobile device based on, at least in part, the routing and the determined IP address***, as recited in claim 24. Rather, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio merely disclose communication over a wireless network using one mobile device. (See, e.g., Rogalski *et al.* paragraph [0038]; see, e.g., Kallio at paragraph [0024]).

Further, for similar reasons, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest ***storing information related to limiting use of at least one of the first mobile device or the second mobile device; and limiting use of at least one of the first mobile device or the second mobile device based on the stored information***, as recited in new dependent claim 27. (Support for this element can be found at, e.g., Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0029] and [0044]).

New dependent claim 29 recites *directing the call to a third mobile device via a wired connection, the third mobile device associated with the subscriber; and routing the call to the first mobile device, the second mobile device, or the third mobile device based on, at least in part, whether the first mobile device, the second mobile device, or the third mobile device is answered by the subscriber*. (Support for this element can be found at, e.g., Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0057] and [0059]). Applicants' representative respectfully submits Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest *directing the call to a third mobile device via a wired connection, the third mobile device associated with the subscriber; and routing the call to the first mobile device, the second mobile device, or the third mobile device based on, at least in part, whether the first mobile device, the second mobile device, or the third mobile device is answered by the subscriber*, as recited in claim 29. Instead, Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio merely disclose communication over a wireless network using one mobile device. (See, e.g., Rogalski *et al.* paragraph [0038]; see, e.g., Kallio at paragraph [0024]).

New dependent claim 30 recites *directing the call to the second mobile device via a regulated wireless connection or a wired connection, the second mobile device associated with the subscriber*. (Support for this element can be found at, e.g., Applicants' specification at paragraph [0054]). It is respectfully submitted that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest *directing the call to the second mobile device via a regulated wireless connection or a wired connection, the second mobile device associated with the subscriber*, as recited in claim 30.

New independent claim 31 recites *a subscriber component that utilizes one or more computing devices to: assign a telephone number of a subscriber to a mobile device operable within an unlicensed wireless network and an other mobile device operable within a licensed wireless network ... direct the call to the mobile device via the unlicensed wireless network when the call is received at the mobile device or directs the call to the other mobile device via the licensed wireless network when the call is received at the other mobile device; and a wireless network component that: receives a medium access control (MAC) address from the mobile device via a wireless connection of the unlicensed wireless network; assigns an internet protocol (IP) address to the mobile device based on the received MAC address; and routes at least one of data or voice traffic associated with the call to and from the mobile device based on the assigned IP address*, and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented

above with respect to claim 23. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0046] and [0052]-[0073]).

New dependent claim 32 recites *the subscriber component determines whether the initiated communication is received at the mobile device or the other mobile device within a specified period of time*. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, Applicants' specification at paragraph [0067]). It is readily apparent that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio fail to teach or suggest *the subscriber component determines whether the initiated communication is received at the mobile device or the other mobile device within a specified period of time*, as recited in claim 32.

New dependent claim 37 recites *a restriction database storing information related to restricting use of at least one of the mobile device or the other mobile device; and an application server restricting use of at least one of the mobile device or the other mobile device based on the stored information*, and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 27. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0029] and [0044]).

New independent claim 40 recites *means for assigning an internet protocol (IP) address to a mobile device operating via an unlicensed wireless communications frequency; means for initiating at least one of a voice or data communication with the mobile device and at least one communications device based on a telephone number associated with the mobile device and the at least one communications device, the at least one communications device operating via at least one of a licensed wireless communications frequency or a wired data network; means for determining whether the at least one of the voice or data communication is answered at the mobile device or the at least one communications device; and means for routing the at least one of the voice or data communication to the mobile device or one of the at least one communications device based on the determining*; wherein *the at least one of the voice or data communication is routed to the mobile device utilizing the IP address*, and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 31. (Support for this element can be found at, *e.g.*, Applicants' specification at paragraphs [0052] - [0073]).

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed subject matter as recited in

independent claims 23, 31, and 40 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 4-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio, in view of Baek (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,726). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 4-6 is moot in light of the cancelation of claims 1-22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 10-13 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10-12 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio, in view of Moore, Jr. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0039242). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 10-13 and 22 is moot in light of the cancelation of claims 1-22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 14-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jones *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,764) in view of Rogalski *et al.* and Kallio. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: the rejection of claims 14-21 is moot in light of the cancelation of claims 1-22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP290USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/

Keith E. Drabek

Reg. No. 60,757

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57TH Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731